A. interpretation: if the aff discloses an AFC interp on the NDCA wiki before the round, the aff debater must only read AFC in the 1ar if the negative violates the interpretation, not preemptively justify AFC in the AC.

b. violation:

c. standards:

1. topic education – cross apply the arguments from the aff. spending many minutes of the AC justifying AFC kills topic education because you spend less time generating topical offense and doing weighing. My interp solves since you only indict the negative and spend a ton of time reading theory if I violate in the 1NC – also a reason why my interp uniquely solves your disads since disclosure on the NDCA wiki will already indicate to me that I should not contest your interp and provides necessary deterrence effect – any risk that we can avoid a theory debate and discuss the topic means my shell comes first.

D. voter:

A. Counter-interpretation: Debaters may challenge either the AC framework or the AC contention, so long as they don’t do both. To clarify, this is a perm to your interp – I can turn the aff or choose to read an alternate standard.

B. Standards:

Solves 100% of abuse on time skew and strategy skew since we collapse the debate to one layer that you can definitely have reciprocal access to – also uniquely better for the aff since it's the framework you’ve already chosen and justified.

Reason to prefer:

1. Phil education – I allow for both topical debate and framework debate. Thinking about DIFFERENT phil is real-life applicable because we have to make personal choices and choose a way to live our lives. AND, LD is the only debate forum where we CAN debate so much philosophy this education is 100% unique to LD. Phil debate best promotes critical thinking. When confronted with a philosophical position, a debater must think or they will lose and analyze deep warrants. AND, in-round phil education is uniquely key since we get to explicitly compare phil authors may not interact in the lit. Even if we can’t decide anything, we can gain critical thinking about the ways warrants interact. *[Even if topic education o/w – a) strength of link, even if topic education is better than philosophy I allow for both whereas you allow for zero phil debate and b) turn it since I increase the breadth of topic education since I allow for real world arguments that apply under different ethical paradigms. Breadth o/w depth in this instance – we need to learn about the vast extent of the topic so we can pursue what we’re interested in later – depth is impossible in 45 min.]*

2. Qualitative ground – every framework offers easier structural access to the ballot for one side – like polls or util might flow a certain way on a certain topic – means that access to a framework debate is always 1:1 since it’s not as if some framework is inherently more true than another one – it’s a question of how good you are, not empirics. K2 to fairness since I need equal offensive access to the ballot – supercharged by AFC – you've prepped the aff and AFC so you’ve focused on prepping the shit out of your contention.

Fairness and education are voters [explain].

This shell is uniquely an RVI even if you claim it’s drop the argument:

a) otherwise it’s a no risk issue for the aff since you could either go for AFC or not and then not debate the framework giving you a 2:1 advantage – skews strategy since you get to collapse to the layer you think you’re winning. I force you to defend your interp, which you should be able to do since you read it, so there’s no strategy skew.

b) there was already in round structural skew since I already couldn’t run a framework under your interp. I needed to waste time reading theory, which I need to commit more time to since I lose my entire core neg strat if I lose the CI.

c) the legitimacy of AFC is an especially contested LD norm, which means competing interps requires voting up the better norm for debate.

A. Interpretation: Debaters can justify frameworks by appealing to fairness or education.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Theory ground – There are many interpretations for a word. You can always argue for a broader interpretation of ought like “moral correctness.” But you shouldn’t assume that interp is true from the start. You enforce a T-interp before the debate even starts. The definition should be contestable since different topics can suggest different kinds of evaluative terms or different scope in terms of fairness and education – should might mean something different than ought, and UTIL might be more predictable on a given topic than others. TURN all your reasons why framework debate is good since I allow frameworks to be diversified every topic. Theory ground is 100% key to fairness since it always directly implicates the ballot – I should be able to make arguments about fairness or unfair practices. If a debater cannot prove his/her framework is fair, then it should be discarded as a judge would any other unfair argument.

2. Topic education – I improve topic education since theoretical arguments and topic-specific philosophy ensure more discussion about the res and discourage all-in framework debates. Topic education outweighs since we only debate it for a few months, but debaters can always recycle frameworks.

BUT turn your philosophy education arguments –

a) This provides for better philosophical argument by weeding out poor frameworks through deterrence and exclusion.

b) If frameworks are unjustified, they should be un-educational. Logic and truth value on the framework debate is preserved under my interp, logic and truth are just strong internal links to education since some framework that grossly mischaracterizes philosophical argumentation would produce unproductive and harmful debate.

b) I allow for philosophical debate once theoretical constraints are ensured.

c) No ground loss – it’s easy to win that broader conceptions of ethics are good for education or fairness.

A. Interpretation: If the aff reads AFC as a theory interpretation in the AC, they cannot normatively justify their framework [aside from clarifications of how to weigh offense under the standard].

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Extend all your reasons why topical education is good – all my interpretation does is maximize the topical education we get by ensuring that you can develop more contention-level offense for me to engage and weigh against. That means it’s always preferable under competing interps for you to spend more time reading topical arguments. Also my interp is always better for aff strategy – otherwise it doesn’t solve for the skew if you spend 3 minutes justifying a framework normatively and reading the shell since you’ll have an uphill battle if I read 7 min of pure offense – that’s a lot more time to develop ballot-accessing arguments.

Preempt – you’re going to say you allow for phil education but a) your strength of link is literally zero – there’s no phil education anyway since we never compare framework warrants that you’ve read so there’s almost no good to reading cards that I can’t contest and b) topic education o/w phil education, so time spent justifying an ethic is ALWAYS better spent reading offense.

A. If the AFF claims they get to choose the framework for the round, they get to defend the framework they justify in the 1AC but must choose a different theoretically legitimate framework for the NEG [that has at least one topical author that links offense into the standard]. To clarify, the AFF must choose the framework for both themselves and the NEG, both of which are theoretically justified.

B. Violation: They force me to debate the same framework as per the AFC argument.

C. Standards:

This interpretation captures ALL the benefits of AFC since you get an advantage for the round in terms of preparation. There’s no time skew since I can’t challenge your framework interpretations for both the AFF and NEG. There’s also plenty of substantive clash since neither you nor I have to justify a framework for long and so we can spend less time on reading old cards on the frameworks debate and more on substance. This solves for all AFF structural skews since I can’t out-layer given that you’ll pick the framework for me and have an advantage in terms of debating it.

BUT, prefer my interpretation:

1. Phil education – Framework debate is key to critical thinking about warranting and ethics. You also HURT substantive education since we can’t debate about real-life applications of different ethical theories. Thinking about DIFFERENT phil is real-life applicable because we have to make personal choices and choose a way to live our lives. AND, LD is the only debate forum where we CAN debate so much philosophy this education is 100% unique to LD. Phil debate best promotes critical thinking. When confronted with a philosophical position, a debater must think or they will lose and analyze deep warrants. AND, in-round phil education is uniquely key since we get to explicitly compare phil authors may not interact in the lit. Even if we can’t decide anything, we can gain critical thinking about the ways warrants interact. All these arguments are reasons why philosophy CLASH is also really valuable, which we don’t get under AFC. *[Even if topic education o/w – a) it’s a question of strength of link – we still get plenty of topic education since the frameworks don’t need to be ethically justified in length, but I’m the only chance for abstract ethics debate and b) turn it since I increase the breadth of topic education since I allow for real world arguments that apply under different paradigms for viewing the res. Breadth o/w depth in this instance – we need to learn about the vast extent of the topic so we can pursue what we’re interested in later – depth is impossible in 45 min.]*

2. Strategy Skew – AFC limits NEG strategic options since I can’t engage on more than one layer of the round. My interp gives the NEG more options since they can engage on both the framework and substance debates. Don’t claim time skew or strategy skew since you know what framework I’ll argue for, which gives you a massive research edge that solves back 100%. BUT turn it back: It’s also better for the AFF since you can gain offense under either standard if you’re losing on the AC substance, which also gives more strategic options for the 2AR and forces the 2N to split its time, which solves time skew from a 6 min rebuttal. Strategy skew is key to fairness since if one side can formulate a better strategy for the round, they have an structural advantage. Especially true in this instance since you spend only 3 minutes generating offense – the rest is theory and framework – which means allowing me to only generate 7 min of 1N offense will just kill your strategy. You also get frameworks tricks ground like skep and presumption triggers which are key ways for affs to win in the status quo but only under my interp.

A. Interpretation: Debaters who read affirmative framework/ethic choice [or topicality interps that argue for a specific ethical framework] must disclose the text of the interpretation on the NDCA wiki at least one hour before the round and the text of the standard they argue will be used to evaluate offense *[along with the text of the plan].*

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

As an overview to the standards debate – I solve 100% of the reasons why AFC is good – it’s a question of whether you should disclose you’re running it.

1. Clash – I allow for more educational debate since I get a chance to prep the aff and actually engage the contention-level – if I don’t know in advance that you’re running AFC, then I’m less likely to concede to the interp since I won’t be prepared and will collapse to theory instead – turns all your reasons why AFC is good since a) I can read nuanced interps like NFF that force you to engage the shell on its own terms, which is the up-layering that gives the NEG a strategic advantage and b) gives me the option of an RVI – which still requires the 1ar to split time. My interp solves since if I can generate offense on the AC I’m more likely to collapse to the layer you want. Also allows you to leverage disclosure against parameters-bad theory arguments – it’s more reasonable for us to have topical debate if I’ve actually had a chance to cut turns. This promotes better topical clash, which is key to education since it’s unique to debate and interacting arguments – if I don’t have capacity to generate offense elsewhere I’ll go hard for theory and we won’t have any.

And, even if my interp allows prepping out theory it’s inevitable if you don’t disclose since it’ll be my best out – there’s at least a risk we’ll have substance in my world since I’ll want to generate two layers.

2. Predictability – I can’t generate offense if I don’t know your standard beforehand since I could never have a reciprocal chance at the ballot under it. Outweighs your internal link – even if prep-outs are bad you’ll know the contention of the AC really well anyway – it’s a question of whether it’s fair for me to engage on the layer you have chosen. Predictability is key since it determines my ability to generate arguments.